WORDS OF RECONCILIATION.

VOL. VII.] MAY, 1891. [No. 5.

☞It is our uniform practice to at once send postal-card receipts in acknowledgment of amounts received for subscription or otherwise.

THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

Through the kindness of the Rev. Andrew Jukes, several copies of *The Literary Churchman*—a Church of England journal—have been sent to us, in which a series of articles upon the Future State, by distinguished members of that Church, have appeared. One of the most recent was by Prebendary C. A. Row, in which he rejects the idea of endless existence in torment, and finds relief in the view that incorrigibly wicked souls must finally cease to be. The last article in the series is by Mr. Jukes, in which he advocates a doctrine of the final salvation of all. The process by which he was brought to this conclusion is so interesting, and the argument he presents from Scripture is so cogent, that we are induced to transfer the whole article to these pages. It forcibly presents certain phases of this subject with which we have made our readers familiar. At the same time it does not guard these views so

carefully against palpable dangers as we have sought to do. There is a point at which the author's conclusion as to the final salvation of all needs to be modified. We shall try to make this plain in a few remarks appended to the article, which follows.

I am asked for a short paper as to my hope of the final Restitution of All Things, and the grounds on which I rest this hope, which as yet is shared by few comparatively of my brethren. Shall I err, if, in attempting this within the limits here assigned me, I try to follow the method adopted by the two chief Apostles, in opening to their brethren the mystery of the Call of the Gentiles, when that truth was yet regarded as a heresy by God's elect Israel. Both St. Peter and St. Paul simply relate their own experience, and the steps by which God had opened to them the truth, that not Israel only, God's elect and first-born, but far off Gentiles also, "having no hope, and without God," might through grace be partakers of God's salvation.

For the doctrine of the Restitution of All Things is to the Church what the Call of the Gentiles was to Israel. It seems to me, therefore, that, though to speak of one's own experience may be open to the charge of egotism, and though, as St. Paul says, a man in speaking of himself speaks as a fool, I yet may best serve my brethren if I briefly recount the stages by which I have been led to receive the hope of the final salvation, not of the elect only, but of all men. I will therefore, as far as my present limits permit, simply recount the steps by which I have been brought to believe that all shall at length be saved, and that where sin hath abounded, grace shall yet much more abound through Jesus Christ our Lord.

I was brought up, as most of the children of religious people were at that time, in the doctrine that those who departed this life without a saving knowledge of Christ

would be punished after death with endless torments. When by grace, quite in my young years, I was awakened to desire to live for God, though my own state as a sinner had often troubled me, I had comparatively little thought about the ruin of the myriads, who, as I had been taught, would be in hell forever. Like Jacob, I could accept the birthright without much real sorrow for the Esaus who lost it. Like Israel, I could hear of Egypt's first-born being destroyed, and of God's giving Egypt for my ransom, and Ethiopia and Seba for me, without a sigh for Egypt or Ethiopia, who are smitten to bring God's elect out of the house of bondage. Children rarely think much of other's pains, and I was then a babe in Christ. Had I then been asked what I believed of future judgment, I should have said that the Bible declared the endless punishment of the unconverted. So I had been taught, and Holy Scripture seemed in certain places to say this. So therefore I believed, as much as a man can be said to believe, in such a doctrine.

The first doubt upon this subject, if I remember right, came to me while I was yet an undergraduate at Cambridge, when, as according to my daily practice, I was studying the Bible in my rooms, I came once and again to the expression, "forever," used of the Aaronic priesthood, and the tabernacle service, and other things of the Jewish dispensation, now "done away," all of which were said to be "forever." Then in the books of the Kings and in the Prophets I found the words, "the fire shall not be quenched," used of the destruction of the first Jewish temple, built by Solomon, then of Edom, then of Jerusalem, then of the house of the King of Judah and the forest of the south, and lastly of the punishment of the wicked in the time of the latter-day glory, which last seems to be the passage quoted by our Lord when He says, "Their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." These passages struck me, but I still held the views I had

been brought up in. The texts, however, had met me, and I could not quite forget them.

Then as years went on, and I gave myself still more to the study of the Scriptures, I could not hide from myself that there was, at least in our English Version, an apparent contradiction in them as to "the last things." This did not make me doubt the Scriptures, for they had been a living voice to me, but it led me carefully and prayerfully to search for the key to the difficulty. Here are some of the apparent contradictions which struck me: "few finding the way of life," and yet "in Christ all made alive," God's elect a "little flock," and yet "Christ the Saviour of the world," and "all the kindreds of the earth blessed" in Him—"mercy upon all," and yet "everlasting punishment"—the "restitution of all things," and yet "eternal destruction"—the "wrath of God forever," and yet "all things reconciled to Him"—"eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels," and yet the "destruction through death not of the works of the devil only, but of him who has the power of death, that is the devil"—the "second death," and the "lake which burneth with fire," and yet "no more death or pain," but "all things subdued to Christ," and "God all in all." All these are the very words of Holy Scripture. Again and again I asked what could this apparent contradiction mean.

Gradually, as I continued daily not only reading but praying over the Scriptures, three truths opened to me, which seemed to solve the difficulty.

The first was the teaching of the Old Testament respecting the First-born—that the First-born had special privileges, such as of being priests and kings; that is, of interceding for and ruling over their younger brethren; that on them devolved the duty of Goel or Kinsman-Redeemer, to redeem a brother who had waxen poor and sold himself unto a stranger; to avenge his blood; and to redeem the inheritance, if at any time it had been lost or

alienated. To sustain these duties God gave the First-born a double portion. I had always believed that Christ was First-born, the "First-born from the dead." It now began to dawn upon me that this involved far more than I had ever thought, namely, that in the matter of deliverance from the power of death there were first-born and later-born, and that to Christ's members, as first-born with Him, belonged in and through Him the same glory of being "priests and kings to God" to serve the later-born. As time went on, two of the Church's Feasts, "All Saints' Day" and "All Souls' Day," came to confirm what I had first gathered and received from Holy Scripture.

The second great truth which opened to me upon this subject arose out of the "times and seasons" of the old law, as set before us in the succession of the Jewish Feasts, and in the varied periods appointed by God, at which cleansing and redemption might take effect; all of which pointed to various stages in the redemption of mankind, and opened to me the mystery of what the Apostle calls, "the ages" and "the purpose of the ages." In the "Feasts of the Lord" one came before another. There were varied times for bringing to God the fruit which grew out of the dark earth; first, the first unleavened first-fruits at Passover; then the second leavened first-fruits at Pentecost; months after which, at the end of the year, came the Feast of Ingathering, called also the Feast of Tabernacles, "when thou hast gathered in all thy labors out of the field." And I read in the New Testament this exposition of the old law: "We are a kind of first-fruits of His creatures," and "if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy." "For now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits: afterward, they that are Christ's" (who

are also called "first-fruits") "at His coming: then (or after that) cometh the end, when all things shall be subdued unto Him, that God may be all in all."

And no less pregnant with blessed teaching were the other "times and seasons" of the law. For there were both "times" and "times of times;" first "seven times" or years, bringing the Sabbatic year of rest, and then "seven times of times," that is, seven times seven years, which brought the Jubilee. In some cases a debtor or bondman might go free at the Sabbatic year: in other cases, not until the year of Jubilee. So again as to cleansing. In the case of the leper, and of him that was unclean by the dead, there were varied times when he might be cleansed, and come again into the congregation of the Lord. So, too, in the purification of the woman, that is, our divided nature; if a son was born, her cleansing was complete after forty days: if she bore her like, that is a female child, not till twice forty. In this last case the Church again helped me, by counting as one of her Feasts, the "Purification of Saint Mary." These and other like shadows of the law gave me the clue to the teaching of the New Testament, so much overlooked, as to the "ages" (*αἰῶνες*), and "age-times" (*χρόνοι αἰώνιοι*), some past, some future, through which, by death and judgment and resurrection, the age-working God (*Θεὸς αἰώνιος*) is carrying out His "purpose of the ages." To attempt to enter upon all this within my present limits is impossible. But I may say that these "age-times" are the key to unlock all that is hid under the word which our Authorized Version translates "eternal" or "everlasting," but which is literally "age-long" or "of the ages," and refers, I believe, always to the times during which the present fall (for Scripture asserts a fall) is being remedied. Any one who cares to see what I believe is the truth on this point, may find more respecting it in my little volume, entitled, *The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things.*

But a third truth, namely, the true meaning and reason of the Cross, and that for sinners death and judgment, with or through Christ, are the only way of life, acquittal, and salvation, did more than all the rest to open to me the mystery of the Second Death, and the connection of God's future judgment with the Restitution of All Things. For the question really is, How is a sinner saved? Of course I always confessed in word that salvation was through Christ's death and resurrection. I saw, too, in measure that the sacraments were linked with this; that we were "buried with Christ by baptism into death," and must "eat His flesh and drink His blood." But I had been brought up in the so-called Evangelical doctrine, that we are saved by Christ *from death*, rather than that we are saved, in and with Him, and by Him, *through death* and *out of it*. The whole New Testament, as it opened to me, seemed to show that the notion of being saved *from* death was a misapprehension, contrary, not only to the facts of life, but to the truth so constantly repeated that we are "baptized into Christ's death;" that "if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him;" and that only "he that is dead is freed from sin." I now saw that Christ took our place and curse, not that we should never know it—for we are by nature in it—but that by bearing it for us and with us, and by bringing us His life, into our place or standing where we were, He might lift us out of it by His death and resurrection; that therefore vicariousness and substitution did not mean (as I had been taught) that Christ died that I should not die, and suffered that I should not suffer; but rather that in the same way of death and life with Him, we should come, in Him and with Him, from the place into which we had fallen, and into which He came for us, to that place where He has gone before us; not by escaping death and judgment, but through death and judgment, which in God's wondrous wisdom are made the way of life and righteousness. Thus I saw that

the lost are lost because they go away from this world without having received the living Word, which condemns and slays the old, and quickens the new, life; without having died to sin; with the fallen life of selfhood yet unjudged and unslain in them; and that therefore for them, even as for the elect, though not at the same time, the one only way of deliverance is by a death to sin through God's judgment, and by a resurrection through Christ out of it. In the elect or first-born the life of selfhood is condemned and slain in this world, though even in them "to die to sin" requires both "the waters and the fires." In the non-elect or later-born, this fallen life, not slain here, is slain at the Second Death (for surely it is not a good life which God then slays) by the judgment and condemnation, without which no fallen creature can be consumed to be re-made "a new creation." Who has taught us to say that there is no resurrection from the Second Death? Scripture rather says, that "the ministration of death and condemnation" is "to be done away," and "death" to be "swallowed up in victory." God does, indeed, as the Psalmist says, "turn man to destruction;" but again He says, "Come again, ye children of men." Death and destruction are not the end, but only stages of the appointed way. The mystery of the gospel is that the "curse is turned into a blessing." But there are still not a few, like the children of Israel of old, who, by reason of the veil, "cannot steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished."

There are many other points I might have touched, but space forbids. I therefore only add that St. Paul's "delivering certain brethren to Satan, for the destruction of their flesh, that their spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord," only repeats the same teaching. Souls are taught by being delivered to Satan, and their spirits are saved and their flesh destroyed by being put into the hands of God's enemy. What does this not teach us as to God's purpose toward those whom He also delivers to

Satan, and disciplines by evil, since they will not learn by good.

But it is said that the Church has condemned this hope. I ask, Where has she done so? At what Council, or in what Decrees, received by East and West, shall we find the record and the terms of this condemnation? Individuals, I know, have judged the doctrine; and the Western Church since Augustine's days, led by his great authority, has generally received his view of endless punishment. But it is a mistake to say that the Catholic Church has ever yet authoritatively condemned this hope of Restitution. Just as all through the Jewish dispensation there were prophets, who foretold to their unbelieving brethren God's purpose of mercy toward the Gentiles, so in every age of the Church, though comparatively few have received the truth, God has had His witnesses to the Restitution of All Things. Some of the greatest of the Greek Fathers certainly held it. And our English Church, though in her original Forty-two Articles she declared that "All men shall not be saved at length," within a very few years, in Elizabeth's reign, struck out the Article. The Creeds received by East and West, not only make no mention whatever of "endless punishment," but in their declaration of "the forgiveness of sins" seem to teach a very different doctrine. On this point I can only here refer my readers to my pamphlet on *Catholic Eschatology*, and to the Revs. A. Gurney's and H. H. Jeaffreson's joint volume, entitled *Our Catholic Inheritance in the Larger Hope*, and to the Rev. F. N. Oxenham's work entitled, *Everlasting Punishment—Is it De Fide?*

I will only say, in conclusion, that I feel, respecting this great subject, what the Apostle said of his gospel of the Cross, that "of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." The question really is, "How are the dead raised up?" And the answer, whether for the first-fruits or for the harvest, is but one—"That which

thou sowest is not quickened except it die." "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead," who, having not died to sin in this world, must die the "second death." I think of the question of the Psalmist—"Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction?" And, in the faith that "Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord both of the dead and of the living," to all these questions I answer, Yes. Will any dare to answer, No?

ANDREW JUKES.

REMARKS.

It is not necessary that we should specify to our readers the salient points of agreement between Mr. Jukes' views and our own. The most prominent of these are the purpose of God in election and the hope for all that is contained in the provision to raise all from the dead. The necessity remains, however, of reconciling these hopeful promises with the repeated declarations of God's Word that "all the wicked will He destroy." Nor must the wicked in any way be encouraged in the thought that their final salvation is assured, whatever they may do. It is no way to escape from this difficulty by rejecting or explaining away this restitutionary teaching which Mr. Jukes brings out so plainly from the very heart of Scripture. But, in our judgment, the whole danger is avoided by a proper understanding of what our Lord means when He warns men against "losing themselves." We have insisted that the personal man becomes incapable of destruction by death only as he expresses the divine side of his nature. In every man, however sinful, there is at the root of his

being this divine nature, his true self, but it may be dormant. The judgments of God against the sinner must finally destroy the accretions of an evil life under which this true self lies buried. From this point of view the hope is legitimate that all will be finally saved. But there seems to be a law of spiritual being by which untamed and hostile spiritual powers are able to repress this divine ego in man and build up around it a false and evil personality which is no fit expression of divine manhood, and which must be destroyed.

It is, therefore, in no sense true that such evil personalities can be saved. Their end is destruction. The danger of the doctrine of restitution, which is a true doctrine, lies in its fostering in the breasts of evil men the hope that *in this character*, with which their personal development has been so closely identified, they will be saved, whereas the whole body of it must be burnt up in God's consuming fire. The only salvation for man consists in the outbirth, the nurture and self-assertion in him of the true and divine human nature, until it assumes its proper place of complete control of the whole outward man and all his surroundings. There is a false self, the counterfeit of the true, an evil personality which crowds itself into the place of the true, so that it appears to be the man's true self, and becoming the only self of which he is conscious. There is a sense, therefore, in which the destruction of such a man must carry with it the destruction of personal identity and self-consciousness. And, from this point of view, it is necessary that men be continually warned that they are in danger of losing themselves and of being cast away.

We would by no means imply that Mr. Jukes does not hold and testify to all this class of truth. No one has written more forcibly of the necessary destruction of the old man, of the inevitable burning up of all the treasures and accumulations of an evil life. But he has not made it as plain as we could wish that even personality and self-consciousness must be involved in this loss, so far as they have become identified with this "old man," and so far as they have failed of being developed into a true manhood in Christ.

That his views, however, are essentially true upon this point, and that our difference is partly in the use of terms, we have pleasing evidence in a recent letter, in which he says:

"When I use the word 'personality,' I mean by it, not man's false self-life or self-consciousness, but his *true being*, for to me nothing evil is true being; and therefore I should say, no true personality can ever be destroyed, the fallen life being only a phantom-personality which must be destroyed by the manifestation in us of man's true nature. All the great Church Fathers saw and taught that evil is not a nature, or true being, but only the perversion or corruption of a nature—otherwise we must accept Manicheeism—that is, a belief in two eternally opposing principles. The decisions, too, of the Third General Council at Ephesus in the question raised by Nestorius as to our Lord's person, as also the decision of the Second General Council, condemning Appolinaris, as to what is true humanity, both, as it seems to me, show what the Church's view has always been, not only as to what man's nature really is, but also as to the question, What is 'personality?' Need I say, it would require a pamphlet to go into all this. I therefore content myself with saying that to me '*being*' and

'*personality*' are really the same. I do not accept the fallen life or fallen existence as *true being* or *personality*."

We have preferred to use the term "individuality" to define what Mr. Jukes calls "true being," and to apply the term "personality" to the outward being, which may only be a mask concealing the true being. Mr. Jukes prefers to speak of this as the "phantom-personality." It is a mere difference in terms. This phrase

"PHANTOM-PERSONALITY"

is happily chosen, and it may serve to suggest something which has an important bearing upon the whole subject. If the true essential personality resides in the divine-human nature in man, the false personality must be the result of the working in and through him of spiritual agencies foreign to that nature. These agencies we believe to be the "evil spirits" of Scripture, which are, probably, those of the imperfect dead. We have heretofore found reason for believing that such spirits are constantly seeking to find their way back into embodied life through the organisms of the living, and that the living become, in some way, the only channels for their deliverance. It would seem, therefore, that they enter largely into the formation of these "phantom-personalities" which enwrap and conceal the true self in man, and that the destruction of these is a part of the delivering work which He was manifested to do who came to destroy the works of the devil. His work of salvation is to evoke, to liberate, and to invigorate this true ego in man, until he obtains supreme control over all the warring spiritual forces of which his

organism has become the refuge and the centre. The two sides of Scripture teaching concerning retribution and restitution are at once harmonized, when we come to see that the first relates wholly to that false personality into which he has grown by reason of the devil's lie engrafted on to the stock of his true nature, and that the second relates wholly to the restoration of his true and essential self as the root and ground of his personal being. We are thus enabled to wield all the damnatory passages of Scripture against man, the sinner, without abatement of their full meaning, and at the same time are left free to cherish without limit those large hopes for man and for the race which the other class of Scriptures warrant, and which inevitably arise in our minds with the true conception of the character of God.

FUTURE PROBATION.

We clip the following from the *New York Sun's* report of a recent sermon by the Rev. Dr. Charles A. Briggs:

"There are a great many people," he said, "who would be very happy if they could have some sure evidence that the great mass of human beings who have gone down to the abode of the dead without the light of salvation will have an opportunity to be saved in the future world. For myself, it would be one of the happiest feelings of my life if I could be assured of that fact, but in all my years of study I have failed to discover any foundation for such a belief." Dr. Briggs then spoke of the Lord as the keeper of the keys of Hades. "It is a blessed thing that He has them in His keeping, and no mortal being, for we, in our imperfections, would surely shut up many in that dark

abode of the dead who are unworthy of such punishment."

"I give thanks to God that He has not intrusted the keys to any Presbyterian General Assembly or other theological convention, for I know that they would shut up many whom the Lord will undoubtedly save."

We have heretofore had occasion to notice that Dr. Briggs' utterances on this subject are rambling and confused. He has said many things which do not consist with any other supposition than that he believes in a future probation. At other times he seems to deny this hope.

If a great many good people would be made happy if they had sure evidence of a hope for the dead, and if, as Dr. Briggs says, it would be one of the happiest moments of his life if he could be assured of that fact, it is pertinent to ask whether the goodness of God is not superior to the instincts of these good people in this matter? Dr. Briggs surely ought not to be happy over such an anticipation if the thing desired were not really just and good. And, if it be this, then God must not only desire it but bring it to pass.

We would like to ask, too, whether there may not be found a better and more Scriptural basis for this hope than the ordinary view of future probation supplies. Dr. Briggs is convinced that the trend of Scripture is against that theory. So think the majority of orthodox interpreters. And yet this hope will not down in their hearts. Suppose then, we ask, whether there is not a basis for it which they have overlooked. What if we shall one day discover that the dead and the living of the human race are so bound together in one organism that the dead virtually

get another probation in this life through the living, and that there is a class of the living—the quickened in Christ—who become their helpers toward rescue and victory. Then we shall begin to understand how all the families of the earth were to be blessed in a chosen seed, and that the dead are a part of the "all." We shall see how the numerous promises of restoration and future blessing to sinful Israel and to Gentile nations, spoken by the mouth of all God's holy prophets, can be fulfilled, and that these promises cover the case of the generations of their dead. We shall see that what we have to look for in the Bible is not evidence for a "future probation" as it lies in the mind of Dr. Briggs and the numerous interpreters who reject it, but evidence for the redemption through a chosen seed of the generations who have gone down to death under the just judgment of God, and evidence that, by the constitution of the race, this seed becomes the repository of the lives from which it sprang in such a way that its triumph over sin and death opens the way for their recovery. These ideas are the deep underlying thoughts of all Scripture. They show that "the hope of the dead" does not lie in a gracious preaching of the gospel to them in an intermediate state, but in the hope that, through the triumph over sin and death of some kinsman redeemer, they may be released from the bands of death. Their future probation therefore must be in his probation. The trial must be fought out here on this arena of flesh and blood. These lost ones must in some way come into an associated responsibility and interest with these contestants, so that the victory of the one shall be that of the other. And these contestants must so enter into the fellowship of Christ's

sufferings as to yield themselves willingly, as did He, to this baptism in behalf of the dead.

Let Dr. Briggs, therefore, give up searching Scripture for grounds upon which to build his possible theory of a future probation, and seek to connect the hope which he says he so ardently covets with the Scripture hope of the redemption of the dead through a living seed, quickened in Christ and made partakers in the power of His resurrection. He will then soon find the foundation for his belief which he says that he has so long vainly sought.

ARE THERE FEW THAT BE SAVED?

Upon the first reading of our Lord's reply to this question (Luke xiii) we infer that He meant to make the impression that but few are saved. He affirms that salvation can only be won by intense effort, that many who seek for it will not be able to attain it. "Many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." With this accords His saying in another place (Matt. viii, 13), "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." All His teaching about the way of life and the terms of discipleship show that men are required to forsake all that they have, to cut off every offending member, that the whole body be not cast into hell. When we have pondered all that Jesus says in this connection, we shall cease to wonder that only a little flock

received the message, and that but few were willing to be saved.

And yet such an expectation does not harmonize with other of His sayings, which imply that His message was good tidings to all the world, and that, when lifted up, He would draw all men unto Him.

The reconciliation is found in that emphatic word with which this paragraph in Luke closes, and which was repeated on other occasions: "And behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last." The salvation of the world is progressive, every man in his own order. There is a "first" class and a "last." In our Lord's day "Many were called but few were chosen." Few were prepared for that denial of self and that loss of all things to which He summoned men if they would follow Him. And so it has been through the whole history of His Church. The elect have never been a numerous class. The drama of the world closes with the vision of only 144,000 who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. But there is a later vision of a multitude which no man can number, who stand on a lower plane, and who are yet saved.

All this teaches that salvation is a much more thoroughgoing process than most of us conceive it to be. It is a work of thorough renovation and transformation. Only the pure in heart can see God. Few of us enter at once into the fullness of what this means, and of that death to sin and self which this requires. The elect have always been a little flock. But then it would be a great mistake to conclude that God's boundless mercies reach only to the elect, and that no others will be saved. There is a first-

fruits and a harvest. Those who are not "first" are not thereby forever excluded. They may be even "last." But it is necessary to know that there is this order in the series, and that not even the last are beyond the reach of God's mercy, before we can estimate the true import of our Lord's reply to this question, "Are there few that be saved?" His answer is, "Yes, there are now but few: the terms are so rigid that only a little flock can be found who are willing to accept them. They shall be the first in my kingdom. And these first shall come from unexpected quarters. They will not be of the class that men would select as likely to press into the kingdom. Many of these will be last to seek it." But it is obvious that they could not be even the last, if they were forever to be shut out because they were not among the first. "Behold there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last."

ATONEMENT.

An evil consequence of the grossly exaggerated view of retribution which has so long been dominant in the Church has been perversion of the truth concerning the Atonement. The divine justice is conceived of as requiring the eternal suffering of the sinner in hell. To satisfy this justice and to ransom us from this awful penalty, it is assumed that Christ bore the sinner's penalty, or an equivalent for it, in His sufferings on the cross, and that, on the ground of this sacrifice of inestimable value, divine justice is satisfied and the sinner justified.

The radical vice of this conception is that it supposes

that Christ died to save man from the *penalty* of sin, whereas the Scripture representation is that He died to save us *from our sins.* Men are freed from punishment for sin, only as they are freed from the sin which requires punishment.

It is manifest that this penal theory is inconsistent, not only with Scripture, but with facts. If the wages of our sin be temporal death, the believer in Christ does not escape that; or if the wages be eternal death, our Substitute did not surely bear that penalty. The fact is, there is no arrangement in the divine government by which the sinner can escape the just consequences of his sins. It would be the worst thing for him if he could. God's judgments are His way of teaching men righteousness. The law of the Lord is perfect. No penalties are imposed but such as the case demands and are absolutely right. None, therefore, can be remitted. What is remitted is *sins*, not penalties. Nor can the innocent suffer for the guilty in such a sense that he can be treated as guilty under the law in lieu of the sinner. No such legal fiction could stand in the court of eternal truth and justice. It is impossible under the government of God. The Lord Jesus was not *punished* vicariously for us, although His sufferings were vicarious. He suffered, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. A king might undergo great hardships, and endure personal suffering, even unto death, in order to rescue his subjects from some hateful tyranny or to win back their allegiance, but he would not endure this as a punishment. It would be the sacrifice of love.

There is one point of view indeed from which it is

proper to use the words "ransom" and "penalty" of our Lord's sacrifice. His death undoubtedly effected our ransom from death, the proper wages of sin. Our lives were forfeited, and He redeemed them from destruction. But His death was not a ransom-price paid to divine justice to buy us off from this penalty. Nor was it, as some of the Fathers viewed it, a quit-claim price paid for our deliverance to "him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil." Such is the mysterious constitution of man, and such the effect of sin upon it, that human nature could be rescued from the spiritual powers that enslaved it only through a dissolution of the flesh and blood (the old man) which these powers had usurped and debased, and the new creation of man in a form suited to the divine nature, which is the true essence of his being. The fire of God's holiness is so searching that sinful flesh—in the fashion of which Jesus was made, and yet to the behests of which He never once yielded—could not surrender itself in perfect obedience to the divine will, except as it yielded itself up to death in order to reconstruction in a new form of manhood perfectly pliant to the will of God. Only the Son of God could carry human nature through the depths of this sacrifice, and bring it safely through, transformed and glorified. Hence "He was found in fashion as a man and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross—wherefore God hath highly exalted Him." And He gave Him power to carry us safely through the same "strait gate and narrow way" of entire surrender to God's will, requiring the death in us of that flesh and blood which cannot inherit the kingdom of God, and our renewal in His likeness through the power of His resurrection.

This is the deep meaning of the death and resurrection of Christ, by which He effected atonement between man and God. He bore our penalty only in the sense that He took our flesh in which penalty inheres. He did nothing for us in order that we might be saved from doing it. He sacrificed nothing in order that we might escape sacrifice. He bore no punishment that we might escape it. On the contrary He came into the place of our penalty in order that He might save us, not from it, but through it. He died unto sin in order that we might die unto it. He suffered in order that we might have fellowship in His sufferings, and in the joy that was set before Him.

RECONCILIATION.

What has been effected by the Atonement is reconciliation between man and God. The Reconciler in the case is God, or God in Christ. The method of His reconciliation was to destroy our enmity by removing from us the sins which produced it. This destruction could be effected only by the destruction of the evil nature—the old man—in which the principle of sin resides, and the raising up in man of a new and divine nature which cannot sin because it is born of God. But, in order to this result, God Himself must come into union with sinful flesh in such a way that in the power of His holiness it might be yielded up to the death or destruction which it deserves, and, in the power of His life, human nature itself might not perish in this destruction, but be raised out of it in righteousness and newness of life. God came thus into union with man in the person of the Man Christ Jesus. The complete

subjection and sacrifice of the human nature to the will of God, even unto death, was made. And out of that death human nature in Him was raised, renewed, and purified and made immortal, and holding such relation to the human race as to be the source to it of a new and cleansing fountain of life.

It is obvious, therefore, that those theories of the atonement which start out with the idea that the death of Christ was a penalty inflicted upon Him as man's substitute and for the satisfaction of divine justice, are unworthy and dishonoring. Christ died for our sins, the just for the unjust, not in the way of vicarious punishment, but as a vicarious sufferer. In His sufferings endured for us there was nothing fictitious nor forensic. There was the surrender by this one perfect representative Man of the flesh and blood nature in which sin resides, and in which He had struggled to the end without sin, to the will of God—the yielding of it to death, in order that through death He might recover man's nature freed from sin, and become the source of cleansing and of a purified and eternal life to all His brother men.

An experience of many years in the ministry—a ministry begun under the domination of this idea of the atonement as the penal payment of our debt—convinces us that many souls are deluded by this idea into indifference as to personal character and righteousness of life, without which no man shall see the Lord. They come to look upon the atonement as a sort of divine insurance system against the hazards of the future. They are led to desire to be saved from punishment, which they have been taught to look upon as endless, rather than from the sin which brings

punishment. Many persons seem content with the possibility of taking out an insurance against hell near the close of life—a death-bed repentance will even suffice.

The error upon which all this is based is that Christ did something *in our stead* so as to relieve us from the necessity of doing it, whereas His death to sin is our surety that we will die unto it.

His blood cleanses us from sin because His life (the life is in the blood), poured out in death for us and resumed in resurrection, is now communicable to us. It is the energy of that life, quickened and operative in us, that kills the old man of sin, cleansing us from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, and perfecting us in holiness. We are cleansed by His blood when we are inwardly cleansed from all unrighteousness (I John i, 7–9). And this purging process is necessarily a process of judgment as well as of renovation. Christ does not save us *from* judgment for sin, but *through* judgment. The worst thing that could happen to us would be exemption from the penalties of wrong-doing. These are always salutary. They are God's uniform instruments of correction, and if He did not chasten us through them, it would prove that He did not love us, and had given us over to destruction. "O Lord, unto Thee belongeth mercy, for Thou renderest unto every man according to his works" (Ps. lxii, 12).

THE Bible, through and through, insists upon the redemption of the bodies of men, as well as their souls, and of the whole framework of human society.—*Professor Briggs.*

THE LOVE OF GOD.—In his inaugural, Professor Briggs speaks thus of how the Old Testament reveals the love of God.

The love of God rises to its heights in the fatherly love of Deuteronomy (iv, 37, etc.), and the earlier Isaiah and Jeremiah (xxx–xxxi); in the marital love of Hosea, Zephaniah, and the second Isaiah—a love to an unfaithful wife, who has disgraced herself and her husband by many adulteries; to a child who rewards the faithful father with such persistent disobedience, that he must be beaten to death and raised from the dead in order to be saved (Hos. xi, 8, 9; xiii, 14). The love of God as taught in the Old Testament is hard for the Jew or the Christian to understand. It transcends human experience. It seems so impossible even for God, that men must be explaining it away. These wonderful chapters of the Old Testament are neglected in all our creeds and systems of divinity—because these all exaggerate the divine justice and veracity, and fear lest God should be too merciful. Like Jonah, they have not been able to conceive how it is possible for God to redeem the great cities of heathendom. They have not seen that He could have any compassion on the Samaritans and the Moabites, who do not belong to the Israel of God, but are the enemies of the historic faith. They have seen the throne of God, and its pillars of righteousness and justice, and have supposed that sovereignty was enthroned there. They have not seen the *love* that was seated on the throne, and its messengers of mercy and faithfulness going forth with salvation to the children of men (Ps. lxxxix, 14).

The love of God as taught in the Old Testament transcends human powers of conception. None could have taught such love who had not seen the loving countenance of God, and experienced the pulsation of that love in their own hearts. The love of God in the Bible is an invincible,

a triumphant authority that invokes the loving obedience of men.

It is not necessary to depreciate the love of God in the Old Testament in order to exalt the love of the Messiah. The love of God in the Old Testament is the preparation to understand the love of God in the New, who so *loved the world* as to give His only begotten Son for its salvation. Oh! when will men learn that the Bible means exactly what it says! It may destroy *our* logic and *our* syllogism, *our* systems and *our* methods. These we have too long regarded as authorities. Logic and syllogism, system and method, need constant criticism, verification, and revision; for too often they omit the essential thing. Their inductions are too narrow, their comprehension is too limited; they beg their premises and jump to their conclusions. The love of God to the world is more important than all the systems devised by men. It will shine forever as the central sun of the universe, when all the creeds and the theologies have been buried in the oblivion of the eternities. It will go on through the centuries of the world, darting its rays of heavenly light, its beams of divine fire, and its regenerating and transforming movements, until the world knows that God loves the world, and the world adores Him with loving worship.

SALVATION AND ELECTION.

We give place to the following communication from a Presbyterian minister settled in the West. We owe it to our former brethren in the ministry of that Church to give them a chance to express their views. It will be seen that they sometimes go beyond us in their hope of salvation for all.

Is it harmful to teach that all men will finally be saved? Much depends upon how this teaching is done.

If it is done in a *Scriptural* way then it certainly cannot be dangerous, or if any danger seem to arise, we are not responsible for it. For we know that even the best gifts of God are misused by men.

If by salvation of all men is meant that *all will be kept from going to hell*, this is a delusion; but if it is understood that salvation is *saving from sin*, and that all will finally be *cleansed* from sin, this is not an undesirable result, nor a harmful outlook. For who could be harmed by such an event, if the means and way thereto are clearly stated?

But I venture to say, that from the Calvinistic standpoint this objection is altogether improper. Many Calvinists say this "Larger Hope" doctrine is exceedingly dangerous, in that it deceives and ruins souls. But do Calvinists disbelieve what they teach in their Standards? They teach, chapter III, section IV: "These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or *diminished*." Now, this is the number of the Elect, and is in this respect certainly true. God has undoubtedly elected a *certain* number or none at all.

But according to the better light of our day there is reason to believe that this number of the elected constitutes only the *first born*, whose names are written in heaven, and that the rest of mankind, the great bulk or *lump* (Rom. ii, 16) will be the *later born*, and will be saved or harvested afterward. How can a consistent Calvinist cry out that we deceive the people with such an outlook? Who are those that are deceived or ruined? Not the elect, for they *cannot* be *deceived*, as even Christ says: "But the *non-elect* will be deceived!"

How can they be deceived and lost, who were never contemplated to be saved; but whom God passed by? Can any Calvinist consistently bring in any such objection, and yet stand by the Confession of Faith as it stands? But I rejoin, that strict Calvinists deceive in theory their fellow-men, when they hold out the Gospel to all men and yet believe that the Gospel is only for the Elect, and that Christ only died for the salvation of the Elect

The usual resort of making the salvation depend on human free-will overthrows Calvinism altogether, and the other subterfuge of saying that Christ's mediation comes in "*in a certain sense*," but yet not in a *helping* or *saving* sense, is wholly unworthy of a Gospel message. People are really deceived by such talk. How can a man faithfully trust in Christ when he does not know in what sense He died for him? Will a minister dare to say to one, "you are one of the elect," and to another, "you are not?" Can a man first find out whether he is one of the elect, before he can trust in Christ? But how can he *peacefully* trust in Christ, if he does not know first in what sense Christ died for him? But if Christ died for all in the same sense and for the same end, then the *ground* of *faith* is *certain*, though some may build on that foundation in the *first* and others in the *later* ages.

If the *losses* or *gains* connected with receiving Christ *now* or *later*, are properly stated, no more danger can arise than now exists with those who oppose the larger hope doctrine. Indeed, the main thought about salvation is usually only, "*being kept out of hell*." "Christ came to save us from hell." But Christ did not at all come for such an end. He came to *save us from sin*. If we are saved from sin, we need not fear any hell; but if hell is needed by many in order that they may be *cured from the disease of sin*, then heaven cannot be reached by such without such fiery trial. If we cut off the offensive limbs of sin, then the body will be spared from hell, but if we neglect to crucify the body of sin, hell will be required to do the work.

A Presbyterian Minister.

NOTES ON CURRENT TOPICS.

Professor Briggs' Case.—From the tone of the Presbyterian journals, and from the action already taken by several Presbyteries, it seems impossible for the coming General Assembly to avoid being profoundly disturbed at its next meeting. Since our remarks in the last number upon the syllabus of Dr. Briggs' inaugural we have read the full text of the address. It is due to him to say

that the phrases which provoked criticism are less objectionable when read in their connection.

No question is more fundamental than that of the structure and authority of the Bible. Has God given an infallible book to be the Church's perpetual guide, or is she thrown back upon the promised presence of her Lord, dwelling in her by His Spirit as her unfailing source of light and truth, of which indwelling the Bible itself is the product? As much as we value the Bible and loyally seek to follow its teachings, we have no sympathy with the feeling that the discovery of a fallible human element in its composition undermines in any way the foundations of our faith, or that we are left at sea, with no certain criterion of truth.

The questions raised therefore by the Higher Criticism are important, but they are not fundamental. They can only be decided by a wise and competent scholarship, reverent of all that is true and good. Above all, we would insist that the man whom we are to trust in such investigation must have the spiritual mind, which judgeth all things. This is the primary question in the case of Dr. Briggs. To us he appears sometimes rash of statement, and too credulous toward new theories. But in the main he seems to be true in spirit toward the Master, and zealous for the welfare of His Church. If he has been forced to accept conclusions repugnant to his brethren, it may be that he is called of God to give them light at a point where they need instruction. At all events the Church ought not to condemn, until the questions he raises have been candidly and thoroughly examined. God teaches us by tradition; but He also has always employed earnest and able and devout minds to guide us into larger knowledge of His character and ways.

The Presbyterian Church is again confronted with the issue we sought to raise in it a few years ago. We asked the advice of the Presbytery upon this point—whether its Church system made any provision for advance in the knowledge of the truth, and what were the obligations of a minister who believed that he had been put in trust with some truth, important to the welfare of the Church, and yet which was virtually denied in her Confession. On the one hand he is bound by the Confession, and on the other he is

solemnly bound to seek the highest good of the Church, and to be faithful to her by being faithful to the truth. The Presbytery virtually decided that the Standards of the Presbyterian Church could not be called in question at any important point, that any claim to superior light could have no standing within its limits, but must seek for some place outside in which to verify itself. Such a decision locks up within the body whatever error there may be festering there, and quenches the Spirit present in the Church to search out error and lead her on to perfection through the knowledge of the truth. We hope the General Assembly will not repeat this folly in its dealing with the case of Professor Briggs.

It is due to ourselves to add that any sympathy we may feel for Dr. Briggs is not at all due to the fact that his views contribute support to our teachings. They stand in no such need. We have built them on the sure foundation of the Word of God, and the more completely Scripture is proved to contain that Word, the more stable the basis for that hope toward God for all mankind which we have found therein.

The Confession and the Bible.—The members of the senior class in Auburn Theological Seminary were recently invited to give in the class-room their views as to the "relative authority of the Confession and the Bible." The members of the class generally took the correct view that, although their Church assumed that the system of doctrine taught in the Bible was set forth in the Confession, and required of its ministers assent thereto, yet it, itself, recognized the Bible as the only final standard of truth, and therefore, if any one was convinced that its teachings at any point failed to represent the Bible, he was bound to repudiate the Confession at that point. It was assumed, however, that no one could differ in *essentials* from the Confession, except at the peril of being forced out of the Church.

It was a great pity that in the progress of the discussion no one raised the point as to the obligation of a minister of the Church who is convinced that the Confession errs at some vital point, to do his best to correct the error. It seems to be taken for granted

that the Church is of so superior a mould that no one must dare to interfere with its autonomy, even when convinced that its functions are deranged, and its perceptions clouded. Men who differ seriously may leave the Church, but they must not undertake to disturb it with their doubts or denials, even though they believe that their ordination vows impose a necessity upon them to strive to rid the Church of that which obscures her faith and hinders her progress.

THE PRESBYTERIAN of April 1st, in speaking of the decreased receipts of the American Board, ascribes this result to a growing indifference to the cause of Foreign Missions, due to the spread of the belief in future probation. It says:

"People are not disposed to make sacrifices for the conversion of those who have never heard of the gospel in this life, when they believe that God, in His infinite mercy, will give them a chance to accept of it in the other world."

In the form in which the Larger Hope has taken possession of the minds of most Christians, this may be its effect. In their minds, it exists rather as a blind protest against the unreasonableness and horror of the old doctrine, which consigned the mass of the heathen to eternal despair. If their hope were only intelligent, it would be in them the greatest stimulant to self-sacrifice for the conversion of the heathen. For,

1. Christians would realize that the salvation of a first-fruits company from among these heathen must necessarily precede the salvation, not only of the mass of the living, but even of the dead.

2. They would know that whatever hope there may be of a future salvation for the dead must be realized through the living; that it is only as living men are brought to the obedience of the faith, and come into fellowship with Christ's sufferings for the sins of the world that deliverance reaches the dead. The gospel that is to bring hope to the dead can reach them only through the living, who are willing to be baptized for the dead.

Here, then, is a most noble and adequate motive for missions, without seeking for it in the dreadful alternative the *Presbyterian* would present—that all the heathen who are unsaved in this life must go into everlasting torments.

The Rev. Dr. John Hall's protest against the observance of Easter is natural in one whose theological training has been such that he does not understand the true meaning of resurrection, and cannot sympathize with the universal joy that pertains of right to this festival. A resurrection that means damnation to the major part of the human race should rather be celebrated with the habiliments of woe. Even a dreary Scotch sabbath-day is not half dreary enough for a reminder. The instinct of mankind refuses however to be repressed, even among the members of Dr. Hall's own denomination. Even they are waking up to the thought that perhaps the resurrection of the Son of Man has somehow a blessing in it for all the sons of men, and that humanity, as such, has good reason to rejoice thereat.

The Smaller Hope.—In a late number of the *Christian Commonwealth* Mr. J. B. Rotherham thus asks the brethren who object so much to the Larger Hope to define themselves:

"What are the actual dimensions of the hope of those who denounce the hope of others as being too large? For example, what is the exact size of the hope of, say, Mr. Spurgeon, and the editor of the *Christian Commonwealth?* Are these gentlemen agreed as to how small our hope for others ought to be? I am intensely curious about the size of the hope of our Smaller Hope brethren. As they are sounding notes of alarm to others, it may be presumed that they are clear and united themselves. Is it so? They cannot, surely, decline to be explicit in this hour of danger. For one, I declare that nothing short of manly frankness on their part will satisfy me; and to leave them without any excuse I will be perfectly candid myself. They will not then, please, evade the following vital questions: Is it unsound and unsafe to hope for the ultimate salvation of any human beings, who die without faith in Christ? If they say, 'We do exclude all such from the embrace of our hope,' well, then, we shall know. We shall know that our Smaller Hope brethren cherish a hope so small as to exclude all dying infants, all life-long idiots, and all the good Corneliuses in the world, to whom their Peter never came with the saving Word. If, on the contrary, they include others, many or few, and will tell us by what warrant and on what principles they so include them, then perhaps we shall discover something; for instance, who they are that are raising false alarms and confusing vital issues; better still, possibly a bridge of reconciliation may be found over which may cross and recross many who as yet imagine that they differ more than they really do."